

Appl. No.: 10/773,828
Amdt. Dated: March 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed 03/07/2007

Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action mailed 03/07/2007 the Examiner has rejected the claims in the case (claims 1-15) while stating that claims 1 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph set forth in the aforesaid Office Action.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 stating there is no clear antecedent basis for the “inside area” of the frame or “ends” of the side panels and that it is not clear how the side panels are “fitted” into the frame, and rejected claim 10 stating that there is no clear antecedent basis for the “interior area” of the frame. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify these objections and as amended are submitted as allowable over the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. In that claims 2-9 are dependent from claim 1 they are likewise submitted as allowable. Further, in that claims 11-15 are dependent from claim 10 they are likewise submitted as allowable.

In view of the above, applicant submits that claims 1-15 as amended are in proper form for allowance and requests that the application be allowed to proceed to issue.

Respectively submitted,

Edward E. Roberts
Attorney for Applicant
P.O. Box 3206
Dana Point, CA 92629
T: (949) 365-5717

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 21 March 2007.

Edward E. Roberts
Edward E. Roberts
Reg. No. 26,024